DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 218 FL 001 500

AUTHOR BORENSTEIN, WALTER
TITLE THE COMBINED AND THE DIVIDED LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE.
INSTITUTION STATE UNIV. OF NEW YORK, NEW PALTZ. COLL. AT NEW PALTZ.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 53P.

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, CLASSICAL LANGUAGES, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *COLLEGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, CURRICULUM PROBLEMS, *DEPARTMENTS, EDUCATIONAL HISTORY, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, ENGLISH, FACULTY EVALUATION, FACULTY PROMOTION, FACULTY RECRUITMENT, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, LIBERAL ARTS, MODERN LANGUAGES, SURVEYS, TABLES (DATA)

ABSTRACT

THE STRUCTURES OF COMBINED AND DIVIDED LANGUAGE DEPARTMENTS IN 22 SELECTED LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES ARE ANALYZED, AND RELATIONSHIPS ARE EXAMINED BETWEEN DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURES AND (1) FACULTY SIZE AND QUALITY, (2) DEPARTMENTAL OPERATION IN THE INTEREST OF ALL LANGUAGES, AND (3) INVOLVEMENT WITH COLLEGE GOALS AND PROGRAMS. LANGUAGE FACULTIES ARE CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF SIZE, LANGUAGE AREA, TITLES, DEGREES AND TRAINING, FOREIGN DEGREES, RECRUITMENT, AND RELATION TO THE LIBERAL ARTS TRADITION. THE SPECIAL CATEGORIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN AND SENIOR MAN ARE DISCUSSED. THE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES, THE HISTORY OF THEIR LANGUAGE OFFERINGS, AND SOME CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS RECEIVE ATTENTION. SELECTED NATIONAL DATA ARE INCLUDED IN THE FORM OF STATISTICAL TABLES. NOT AVAILABLE IN HARD COPY DUE TO MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENT. (AF)

ED036218

Walter Borenstein
Division of Foreign Languages
State University College
New Paltz, New York 12561

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE COMBINED AND THE DIVIDED LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

WALTER BORENSTEIN, New York State University College, New Paltz

I. PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this study to analyze the combined and the divided language departments in twenty-two selected liberal arts colleges in order to establish the relationship that departmental structure may have with such aspects as the size and the quality of the faculty, the operation of the departments in the best interest of all languages, the extent of successful involvement with the goals and programs of the colleges and some of the dilemmas created by combination or division.

II. THE LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT: STRUCTURE

For the purpose of this study, there will be five classifications made on the basis of language department structure:

1. All languages are a part of a larger department that often includes English. There is one chairman.

2. All languages, classical and modern, are taught within one department under one chairman.

3. All the modern languages are taught within one department under one chairman.

FL 000 500

4. There are at least two departments in modern languages with separate chairmen. French and Spanish are included in a department of Romance Languages.

5. All three modern languages generally considered major languages, French, German and Spanish, are separate departments with their own chairmen.

In many large universities, other combinations may exist in one department, especially where the lesser taught languages are offered. In the course of this study, a combined department will be considered one in which all modern languages are taught in one academic department with one chairman (categories 1, 2 and 3). A divided department will be one with at least two separate academic departments with separate chairmen (categories 3 and 4).

This paper can be considered a pilot study in an area which, although obviously vital to the best interests of language teachers and their work, has been discussed only informally by members of the profession and has been objectively studied by almost no one.[1] For this reason, my selection of this group of liberal arts colleges is not based on any elaborate system nor does it aim at any random sample nor imply that these colleges are in any way typical.

III. THE LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT: NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The data in Table I will offer a national perspective of language department structure on the basis of the type of institution.

(see page 2A for Table I)

TABLE I

DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Type of Institution*	Total of Schools	Schools With No Data or No Language	I French German and Spanish separate	II Romance Languages AHd German**	Total of I and II	III French German and Spanish Combined***	IV English and Foreign Languages****	Total of III and IV	Total with Data
4-Year State Colleges	208	29	3 (1.7%)	14 (7.8%)	17 (9.5%)	127 (71%)	35 (19.5%)	162 (90.5%)	179 (100%)
State and City Universities	168	5	18 (11%)	32 (19.6%)	50 (30.6%)	108 (66.3%)	5 (3.1%)	113 (69.4%)	163 (100%)
Private Universities	102	0	13 (12.7%)	22 (21.5%)	35 (34.2%)	64 (62.8%)	3 (3%)	67 (65.8%)	102 (100%)
4-Year Private Coed Liberal Arts Colleges	408	74	37 (11.1%)	33 (9.9%)	70 (21%)	237 (71%)	27 (8%)	264 (79%)	334 (100%)
4-Year Private Liberal Arts Colleges - Women	173	17	66 (42.3%)	11 (7.1%)	77 (49.4%)	70 (44.8%)	9 (5.8%)	79 (50.6%)	156 (100%)
4-Year Private Liberal Arts colleges - Men	79	5	15 (20.3%)	10 (13.5%)	25 (33.8%)	48 (64.9%)	1 (1.3%)	49 (66.2%)	74 (100%)
TOTAL of all Liberal Arts Colleges	660	96	118 (20.9%)	54 (9.6%)	172 (30.5%)	355 (62.9%)	37 (6.5%)	392 (69.5%)	564 (100%)
TOTAL	1138	130	152 (15.1%)	122 (12.1%)	274 (27.2%)	654 (64.9%)	80 (7.9%)	734 (72.8%)	1008 (100%)

* The determination of categories is taken from Gene R. Hawes, The New American Guide to Colleges, 3rd ed. (New York, 1966). Institutions omitted include 2-year colleges, art, music, business and technical schools.

** In 19 colleges, only the Romance Languages are taught.

*** In 15 colleges, only one language is taught.

**** In some colleges, foreign languages may be combined with Humanities.

An examination of the above statistics will reveal many interesting differences in the structure of language departments between one type of institution and another. The largest percentage of divided departments is found in private liberal arts colleges for women (49.4%.) Most of these colleges are Roman Catholic in religious affiliation and, contrary to a common fallacy about the separation of languages, most of them are small colleges with small faculties. It is important to note that a considerable majority of undergraduates in all colleges who specialize in foreign languages, are women. In 1966, there were 10,974 women undergraduates (70.6%) out of 15,527 students who took their degrees in foreign languages.[2] This tends to verify the continuing trend since 1961-62 when 4,888 undergraduates (70.4%) of the 6,947 majoring in foreign languages and receiving degrees, were women.[3] In this respect, the liberal arts college for women tends to resemble the large university and the relatively greater importance of language study may be a major factor. The smallest percentage of divided departments is found in the four-year state colleges, but this number is steadily increasing as these institutions grow in size and become universities. The traditional role of these colleges in teacher training has helped to maintain the combined language department to best suit the needs of the teachers college. The explanation for the fact that there are a larger number of divided departments in liberal arts colleges for men (33.8%) than in the coeducational liberal arts colleges (21%) may be found in the more traditional character of those institutions which still prefer only students of one sex.

The state and city universities and the private universities seem to have almost the same percentage of divided departments,

30.6% and 34.2% respectively. However, Table II shows that this percentage shows an extraordinary increase when we consider only those universities listed in the University Prestige Study made by Dr. Allan Cartter in 1966 under the auspices of the American Council on Education [4] or those offering a Ph.D. in at least one language. [5]

TABLE II

DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE IN PH.D. GRANTING UNIVERSITIES

Type of Institution	TOTAL	French, German and Spanish Divided	Romance Languages and German Divided	Other Combinations *	Total Divided Departments	All languages Combined
A.C.E. Prestige Study Schools	41	15 (36.6%)	23 (56.1%)	1 (2.4%)	39 (95.1%)	2 (4.9%)
All Schools Offering Ph.D. in one or more languages	79	23 (29.1%)	38 (48.1%)	1 (1.3%)	62 (78.5%)	17 (21.5%)

* One university has a department of French and Italian separate from the rest.

The first category of 41 universities listed in the Cartter Prestige study made a serious effort to determine those graduate schools held in highest esteem by faculty members in specific fields of the arts and sciences. There were 28 universities listed for German, 33 for French and 36 for Spanish, but a total of 41 different institutions for all three categories.

The second category of all schools offering the doctorate in at least one modern language offers an interesting contrast to the figures listed for all state, city and private universities. Whereas only 32.4% of this latter group have divided departments,

78.5% of the institutions offering the doctorate have divided departments. It is quite obvious that such factors as size, years of existence as a graduate institution, the presence of a doctoral program and tradition all play a vital role in the structural character of the language areas in major universities.

IV. THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: THE SAMPLE

The present study is based on an analysis of data, chiefly from the catalogues, but also from other directories and pertinent sources, of 22 four-year liberal arts colleges which are members of two important and recognized college associations. These colleges are among the outstanding institutions of their kind in this whole country and, although they vary considerably from one another in size and reputation, taken as a group, these schools would rank among the top 20% in the nation. Of the 22 colleges, only two are only for men and the others coeducational; they are located in seven states, they are all private and are either independent or are affiliated with some Protestant church. Enrollments for 1967-68 varied from about 2600 full-time students to about 825 students. [6] One-half of the 22 colleges had more than 1350 students, only 4 had more than 2000 enrollment and only 4 had less than 1000. The median for all 22 colleges was 1336 students and the average 1535.

The quality of many of these colleges may be seen in their admission policy. In one standard volume, two of the colleges are listed as "among the most selective," seven as "highly selective," eleven as "very selective," and two as "selective." [7] For comparative purposes, it may be noted that only 30 schools in the country

are listed in the first category, 55 in the second, 181 in the third and 206 in the fourth. Twenty of the colleges in the sample have an active chapter of Phi Beta Kappa on the campus. [8]

The number of full-time faculty members for the sample varies from 63 to 205. [9] There are as many schools with over 110 faculty members as there are with less. Only 4 schools have more than 150 faculty members and only 4 have less than 75. The median number of full-time faculty is 113 while the average is 111. The number of full-time faculty who hold the doctorate or the equivalent varies from 44% to 85%. [10] Six of the schools have faculties with more than 75% holding the doctorate and only 3 have 50% or less. The median percentage is 66% and the average is 65%.

Although there are a considerable number of differences between one institution and another within the two associations of colleges, almost all rank high according to the major criteria established by reputable scholars in studies of "institutional excellence." Alexander W. Astin, perhaps the leading specialist in this area, in a recent article concerning the measurement of institutional quality, listed a total of 69 measures of excellence in American colleges and universities today. [11] In this comprehensive study, six primary indices are presented as major criteria: 1) Selectivity (an estimate of the average academic ability of the entering students), 2) Per-student expenditures for educational and general purposes, 3) Number of books in the library, 4) Number of books in the library per student, 5) Faculty-student ratio, 6) Percentage of faculty with Ph.D. degree. [12] Data on per-student expenditures is not readily available. Library holdings for 1964 for the colleges of the sample show a variation from about 68,000

volumes in the smallest collection to over 564,000 in the largest. [13] Only 3 colleges had more than 200,000 volumes, 7 had between 150,000 and 200,000, 8 between 100,000 and 150,000 and 4 between 50,000 and 100,000. Expenditures for books for the period between 1959 and 1963 varied from about $27,000 to $240,000. One school spent over $200,000, 7 spent from $100,000 to $200,000, 9 spent between $50,000 and $100,000 and 5 spent between $25,000 and $50,000. [14] More recent data on library holdings of these colleges show a variation of volumes in the library per student from 229 volumes to 53 volumes per student. [15] Only 2 schools had more than 200 volumes per student, 8 had between 100 and 200, 6 schools had between 76 and 100 and five schools had between 50 and 75.

In the fifth criterion listed by Astin, the faculty-student ratio, all schools in the sample rank high. They vary from a high ratio of 1 to 15 to a low ratio of 1 to 10. Eleven of the schools have a ratio of from 1 to 10 to 1 to 12. Eleven schools have a ratio of from 1 to 13 to 1 to 15. The average is about 1 to 12.5. [16]

A further aspect of selectivity can be seen in the relative scores on College Entrance Examination Board tests required to enter each of the colleges in the sample. These scores vary from a high of 655 Verbal to low of 485, and a high of 677 Mathematical to a low of 515. On the Verbal portion, 5 schools averaged 600 or better, 6 schools between 575 and 600, 8 between 550 and 575 and 3 schools below 525. On the Mathematical portion, 5 schools scored 625 or better, 7 schools between 600 and 625, 4 schools between 575 and 600 and 6 schools between 500 and 575. [17]

Other pertinent data concerning the colleges of the sample can be offered concerning faculty salaries and compensation, the

number of Merit Scholars, the percentage of freshmen who graduate within four years, the percentage of students who go on to professional or graduate school and other facts dealing with students, faculty and the general reputation of the colleges. It is only necessary to repeat what is now obvious, that all of the colleges of the sample are highly considered and some are among the outstanding in the nation. These schools are an excellent example of highly respected four-year liberal arts colleges and data concerning the structure of their departments of foreign languages will necessarily be relevant to any general analysis of the subject.

V. THE STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

If we make use of the definition established in Section II of this study concerning the nature of a combined or a divided department, then there are 11 combined departments and 11 divided departments in the sample. This division is obviously quite different from the data for all four-year liberal arts colleges in Table I. Table III will show this interesting contrast.

TABLE III

DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Type of Institution	French I German and Spanish Divided	Romance II Languages and German	I and II combined	French III German and Spanish Combined *	Foreign IV Languages and English	III and IV Combined
All 4-Year Private Liberal Arts Colleges	118 (20.9%)	54 (9.6%)	172 (30.5%)	355 (62.9%)	37 (6.6%)	392 (69.5%)
All 4-Year Coeducational Liberal Arts Colleges	37 (11.1%)	33 (9.9%)	70 (21%)	237 (71%)	27 (8%)	264 (79%)
22 Colleges of the Sample	4 (18.2%)	7 (31.8%)	11 (50%)	11* (50%)	—	11 (50%)

* 4 of the 11 combined departments include Classics.

It is clear from the above data that the percentage of totally divided departments is far greater in the sample than for the coeducational liberal arts colleges and about the same as all liberal arts colleges.[18] The percentage of colleges in the sample having departments of Romance Languages is far greater than for the other two categories. The implication of these facts may be that the quality of the colleges of the sample makes them more like the large universities or there may be some explanation from tradition.

VI. LANGUAGES IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: HISTORY

The basic cause of combination in the liberal arts colleges has generally been considered the desire for greater efficiency in institutional operation and a fear of too large a number of "small" separate departments. The smaller the enrollment of the college the more one might expect combined departments. It may be interesting to note that while the four largest colleges have divided departments, the three smallest colleges also have divided departments. On the basis of enrollment, colleges ranking 1,2, 3, 4, 9, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 22 are divided, while colleges 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18 and 19 are combined. The average enrollment for the 11 divided departments for 1967-68 was 1630 students while for the 11 combined departments it was 1440. It seems obvious that there must be other factors to explain the structure of language departments other than the size of the institutions. We must try to explain why one dean will remark, "We don't like the idea of two or three separate departments with two, three or four people," and why another dean will find this acceptable. A study of the structure of the 22 colleges over the past sixteen years may be helpful.

Of the 22 colleges, 8 have had combined departments since at least 1951. [19] Three other colleges have been combined since that time. In the list of 11 divided departments, only one has been completely divided since at least 1951. Four others have had a department of Romance Languages since that time. Three departments have been totally divided from combined departments since 1951, one department has been divided into Romance Languages and German from a combined department since 1951 and two departments have been converted to a division of Romance Languages and German from totally divided departments since 1951. We discover that in 1951, a breakdown of the colleges of the sample would show 13 schools with combined departments and 9 schools with divided departments. The trend among these colleges has apparently been toward further division. The causes of division are often more easy to study than the causes of combination. The kinds of discussion and disagreement which often leads to separation are more open and such conflict may go on for some time and become a part of campus politics. The kind of motivation leading to an administrative decision to combine several departments is more secretive and can be ascertained only by an extensive analysis or discussion with those concerned. Only three of the departments in colleges of the sample were combined from previously divided departments since 1951. In two of the cases, it is apparent from a glance at past catalogues that the decision to combine was either the cause or the effect of the departure of the heads of the previously separated departments. Among the departments which were separated after years of combination, these separations all took place between 1962 and 1966 and can be explained either by increased size of enrollment and faculty or by certain

difficulties that could best be resolved through division.

The tendency away from combinations of disciplines in the liberal arts colleges is obvious from any analysis of departmental structure during the past 15 years. The small enrollments and the small faculties between 1950 and 1956 did not create the need for extended autonomy as in recent years. Also, there were always very small departments such as Classical Languages which could establish a precedent for newer small departments. During these earlier years when combination was more general, one could find combined departments in all areas. History and Political Science, Physics and Mathematics, English and Speech, and Philosophy and Religion were only a few of the possible combinations that generally do not exist today and the recollection of these years is often an unpleasant memory in the divided departments today. However, some combinations still exist among the 22 colleges of the sample and are more common in the smaller schools. The character of these combined departments is very different from the situation in combined language areas. We may find Physics and Astronomy, Economics and Business, Psychology and Education, Sociology and Anthropology, Philosophy and Religion, Speech and Theatre, Geology and Geography, Botany, Bacteriology and and Biology, or Physiology and Biochemistry. In most of these examples we have either a true division within one field or the addition of a lesser allied field to an already established area. The major distinction to be made is that almost only in languages do we find separate majors in each of the languages of one combined department. Further fragmentation can be expected in many currently existing combined areas as the lesser area finds itself stifled by its parent and unable to grow in a creative manner.

A new factor in any analysis of combined departments of languages and the rationale behind their continued existence may be the increased emphasis on the audio-lingual methodology since 1945 and the concurrent growth of the field called "foreign languages." [20] The stress on the study of literature in the graduate schools emphasizes the differences between the different language areas far more than the stress on the teaching of language and the interest in pedagogy. Although journals and organizations have long existed for teachers of foreign languages, the recent direction has created a greater sense of a total field of languages, rather than the more traditional divisions that make up the area. The relationship between combined and divided departments and the new methodology and its tendency to look upon language study as the fundamental aim of the field might be analyzed further to reveal the influence of the unitary concept of languages on the defense of the combined department.

While the desire for separation has been a major factor in large universities where the very number of faculty has had an impact on any structural decision, the liberal arts colleges have not been able to parallel this movement and their administrations have not seen the need for separation.

VII: THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: UNIQUE CHARACTER

There are a number of characteristics of the liberal arts colleges that make their language departments more unique and that create special problems that must be resolved within the framework of the general goals of the colleges. The catalogues of the 22

colleges of the sample offer examples of a statement of the purpose of their kind of education which includes such goals as "enrichment of educational experience," " commitment to a life of personal integrity," "studies designed to liberate students from uncritical thinking and insensitivity," "more than intellectual knowledge," and many similar aspirations related to the highest social and philosophical dreams of mankind. Whereas most universities and colleges tend to speak of these goals of liberal education, it is more often in the liberal arts colleges that these goals become a vital part of the educational process because they tend to occupy a far greater proportion of student and faculty involvement within the total college program.

Within the framework of an educational purpose less related to occupational or professional training, all of the departments of the liberal arts college find themselves involved with a need to establish a closer relationship between the specific objectives of their own discipline and the generalized objectives of the college. It has been shown that a great proportion of students involved in the movement to change curriculum and bring greater relevance to college studies are those interested in general studies. It is because of this need to see the goals of the entire college as the point of reference that many faculty members in languages in the liberal arts colleges find that they must begin to move in a direction opposed to some of the "skill oriented" goals of language learning which thrive better in the larger institution where the department of languages is its own point of reference.

An excellent example of the price that first-year and even second-year language courses pay when they adhere strictly to the

audio-lingual goals can be found in the course evaluations that have become so common on the campuses of liberal arts colleges as the students have pressed for more direct involvement with many areas of the college curriculum. I have had the opportunity to study a large number of these evaluations for a period of two years and the results have shown that while the student may praise the teacher's knowledge, ability and dedication, the language courses that are part of the requirement are victim to the accusation that "they do not encourage discussion," or "encourage the student to think," or "are not really relevant or related to the more meaningful courses of the college." All efforts to convince the student oriented toward a general education that initial work in languages must move in the direction most teachers follow fall on deaf ears and low course evaluations are the net result. Teachers anxious to improve their academic position in the college can not be expected to harm their comparative rating by accepting indefinitely the goals of their profession over the goals of their college. While the sciences and mathematics often share some of the difficulties of language teaching, they are able to survive more readily because of the larger numbers of majors and their national prestige, but their work too has faced the wrath of students in general education searching for relevance. Will the price paid by language teachers in liberal arts college for their adherence to their professional goals be the removal of the language requirement?

This competition between the various disciplines for more students, for majors, for student loyalty is obviously more pronounced in the liberal arts college where the vocational orientation is less pronounced and where students enter without a clear

and rigid idea of their specific goals. In this struggle for survival at the college level, involvement in interdisciplinary programs and the more general purposes of the colleges becomes a major criterion for success. There are a considerable number of students here who demand relevance, involvement, meaningful teaching and creative and inspired programs of learning. When 150 students ask the dean for a new orientation this may represent 10% of the student body at the small college but only 1% or less at the university. It is difficult to explain to them that the program in languages is built on a foundation of the early development of language skills, especially when they will never go beyond the second year. In such situations the liberal arts college creates an atmosphere where a good language program must fit into the general environment of the college in order to thrive. One of the better known colleges of the sample describes this need as follows: "The language department of a liberal arts institution must necessarily be concerned not only with correct expression but also with the intellectual and spiritual quality of what is said. The study of language progresses beyond initial preoccupation with the daily and the banal to what is most worth communicating." [21]

VIII. THE CHAIRMAN

In the 22 colleges of the sample there are a total of 44 departmental chairmen or heads in the languages for the year 1967-1968. Four of these chairmen head a combined department that includes Classical Languages. Heads of separate departments of Classical Languages are not included. These 44 chairmen include 11 chairmen of combined departments, 7 chairmen of departments of

Romance Languages, 6 chairmen of departments of German, 5 chairmen of departments of German and Russian, 5 chairmen of departments of Russian, 4 chairmen of departments of French, 3 chairmen of departments of Spanish, 1 chairman of a department of Spanish and Italian and 2 chairmen of departments of other languages. There are a total of 33 chairmen in the colleges with divided departments and a total of 11 chairmen in colleges with combined departments.

The question of rotation of the chairman is most interesting when studied in terms of combination versus separation of departments. Only one of the 22 colleges in the sample makes specific reference in its catalogue to the need for rotation of chairmen although others encourage rotation in other ways. The need for some rotation in any department has long been considered vital to the distribution of responsibility and the prevention of the "empire" building that can be so detrimental to the liberal arts college. If the need for rotation is obvious in most departments including separate language departments, it is absolutely essential to the meaningful development and growth of the combined department of languages. Because the combined department may have teachers of from three to seven languages, it is apparent that some form of regular rotation among at least the major languages is needed for the well being of any of these languages.

Among the 8 departments that have been combined since before 1951, there have been a total of 22 chairmen in 18 years. This means that there have been 22 chairmen for 144 chairman-years or an average tenure of about 6.5 years. More pertinent by far is the fact that one chairman of the eight served for at least 18 years, 2 served for 15 years, one for 14 years and one for 12 years.

Of the 22 chairmen in the 8 colleges combined since before 1951, a total of 11 served in 2 of the 8 colleges. Among the 3 departments combined since 1960, one chairman has served for 7 years, one for 8 years and one department was combined only a year ago. In the divided departments there are also several examples of long periods of tenure as chairman. One chairman of Romance Languages served for 17 years, another for at least 18 years and another for 12 years. One chairman of German served for at least 18 years, another for 17 years and another for 10 years.

Generally, one can say that there is a tendency for chairmen of combined departments to hold office for longer periods of time than chairmen of divided departments. If one considers Romance Languages as a lesser form of a combined department, this is even more apparent. Anyone in opposition to the combined department might see in this a consolidation of power by either driving out senior faculty in other languages who pose a threat or deliberately seeking weak faculty in other languages. The importance and need for rotation in language departments is a question that can be argued both ways. Some may feel that continuity is a primary goal and that excessive rotation may be a sign of weakness or disruption. Regardless of the specific factors for any given institution, it is my firm conviction that any department ~~of~~ of foreign languages that is combined will inevitably suffer from a long period of tenure as chairman by one individual representing one language. Domination by one man who represents a lower enrollment language for excessive periods of time is intolerable. Of the 11 chairmen of combined departments, 5 are in Spanish, 3 in French and 3 in German. Of the 7 departments of Romance Languages, 5 chairmen are in French and 2 in Spanish.

From the causes of the decision of the administration in the choice of a chairman of a combined department to the activity of the chairman as representative of the several languages, one can see the vital role of the chairman beyond that in importance of any other chairman in the college. The tendency to look upon all languages as one area may be the primary factor, but it is quite difficult to ascertain which is the cause and which the result. Ultimately, the exis nce of separate student majors and the separation of fields make languages unique within the structure of any college. Far too often, the languages fall victim to a kind of split personality- they are one department when the specific college need requires this and they are a divided area when the needs call for this state.

In the combined department the best interests of several fields of study with separate majors are vested in one chairman. From the point of view of "language power" in the institution, the presence of four or five chairmen to represent the best interests of their own languages can not be discarded very easily. The current argument that a large department will have great power and that its very numbers will give it a powerful voice in the affairs of the college is absurd. An analysis of the committee system in the colleges of the sample makes it apparent that very little power is held by faculty members in languages. Also, the number of chairmen in divided departments leads to a greater role by people in languages in the vital committee system of the colleges. Such factors as excessive turnover and excessive low rank in combined departments are an additional factor. The single example of a college administrator drawn from a language department in the sample was

from a divided department. Not only does the existence of a chairman from French in a department of French best support the interests of French studies, but he, along with other chairmen in languages, offer a better total image of languages in general. In a college where there are between 15 and 20 departments, the difference between one chairman in languages (5.5% of 18 departments) and four chairmen (22% of 18 departments) is only too obvious.

The situation is even more extreme when one includes the Classical languages. Now, of 62 chairmen in languages, 4 colleges have one chairman, 7 have 2 chairmen and these are called combined. In the divided area, 3 colleges have 3 chairmen in languages, 4 have 4 chairmen, 3 have 5 chairmen and one has 6 chairmen. So, if we include Classics, the combined departments in 11 colleges have 18 chairmen and the divided departments in 11 colleges have 44 chairmen.

The choice of a chairman is in itself a vital indication of the motives of some administrations. While in a large university, a chairman may be a compromise "administrator," someone to do the paper work while each language governs itself, this is not the case in the smaller liberal arts college. Here, the chairman is often a survivor, someone who has been around a long time. A study of faculty listings over a period of years in a number of the colleges shows the results of a struggle which ends in the departure of several senior faculty and the survival of the chairman.

Finally, there is the important aspect of prestige. I realize that a more elaborate study of individual faculty members and such areas as publication would be necessary to establish some differences. However, one simple criterion could be the number of

special Chairs or endowed professorships in the languages. In the sample of 22 colleges, the 11 combined departments have a total of 2 endowed professorships while the 11 divided areas have 11 endowed professorships. If we add the Classical languages, the results are astounding. Among 11 combined departments, 2 colleges offer no work in Classics and Classical languages are a part of a combined department in 4 others. There are no endowed professorships. Among the 11 divided departments, Classical languages are a part of the English department in one college and there are 8 endowed professorships. Therefore, if we include Classics, there are 2 endowed professorships in the combined departments and 19 in the divided departments.

IX. THE SENIOR MAN

The combination of several languages into one department in the liberal arts college creates an unusual and difficult academic position, that of the senior man in a language. The senior man is the ranking faculty member in the combined department who represents a language other than the language of the chairman. This is not the same as the sub-chairman for a language found in the combined departments of larger institutions. The senior man finds himself in the extraordinary position of having many of the responsibilities of the chairman without most of the authority necessary to fulfill his responsibilities.

Among the 11 combined departments of the sample, there are a total of 34 senior men representing all modern languages. Even in the divided departments, because French and Spanish or German and Russian may be combined, there are 10 senior men. The role of the

senior man is one that is difficult to analyze without use of depth interviews, for only in the day to day operation of the affairs of each language can this vital role be studied. The author of this paper has held this position of senior man for five years and his experiences have gained him numerous insights into the problems facing a professor who must defend the best interests of all work in his language without the authority to hire or fire, without the constant contact with the administration that is available only to the chairman and with the inevitable influence of the best interests of other languages in the domain of his own field.

A brief analysis of the senior men in the 11 combined departments of the sample does reveal some contrasts. The 3 departments which have chairmen in German seem to have the weakest senior men in French and Spanish on the basis of training and experience. The interesting implication here is that, while the problem for the senior man exists regardless of the language of the chairman, the situation for the Romance Languages is generally better when the chairman is chosen from French or Spanish. From the few cases available for this study it can be said that the chairman of a combined department in a liberal arts college has enough power to control the choice of a senior man in another language and that, apparently, the struggles that often arise between chairman and senior man over policy end in the departure of the senior man. My comparison of catalogues over a number of year for some of the combined departments seemsto show this inevitable result in the power struggle.

I have tried to analyze the senior men for the 11 combined departments in an attempt to establish some kind of profile. Of the

33 senior men in combined departments, 17 hold the Ph.D. and 16 hold an M.A. or less.[22] However, it is not simply by this consideration that one studies the importance of the senior man in the structure of the combined department. Through comparisons and evaluations, through personal experience and discussions with other faculty, one tries to establish some basis for the lesser position of a senior man. A number of them have been on the faculty for 15 to 30 years without serving as chairman, others have wives in the same department, a larger number than would be the case for the chairmen are women, and a few hold foreign degrees with doubtful equivalents.[23]

In no place can the dilemma of the senior man be seen so clearly as in recruitment. A potential senior man is brought to a college to see and be seen and he must realize that he will have to take over a whole language area with responsibility for courses and students without having any serious control over administrative decision making. A new Ph.D. or an experienced professor may take the position for such reasons as the prestige of the college, but there may be a quick disenchantment with all the responsibility coupled with limited power to control the destiny of one's field. A less qualified man may be taken who will later finish his work and remain for other reasons, but it will always be difficult to find a trained and competent person at the time he is most needed.

A major obstacle for the senior man in his relationship with the administration will be their false concept that all languages are really one field and share common objectives and methods without serious disagreement as to the philosophy of education. Yet many differences do exist, especially because there is a formal

division among students by language major that is not found in almost any other department of the college. It would be naive and absurd not to recognize the inevitable competition that will pervade a combined department where division is a reality in almost every aspect but the power structure. The search for a competent, trained and experienced senior man is often thwarted in the liberal arts college because the dean and those choosing often do not have the best interests of that language in mind. One need only change the search for a senior man into a search for a chairman for that language to see how best interests can come into conflict. When one takes into consideration such factors as higher salaries for the chairman at a time when resources are limited, when one considers the number of cases in the sample where an assistant professor or even an instructor can be senior man, when one realizes the unwillingness of administrations to look for chairmen more often than they feel necessary, one can see the rationale behind the senior man. In the struggle of opposing best interests, it is apparent that a dean and president, convinced that the folklore of market values places languages at a low level, with the support of a chairman in German and the acquiescence of those in his own language, those in Russian and in French, and low ranking, timid, vulnerable faculty in Spanish, may not make the best choice in their selection of a man for the vital role of senior man in Spanish.

X. THE FACULTY

A. Size

I have attempted to compare the size of language faculties

in combined and divided departments, taking into consideration the size of the student body, the total number of faculty and the rank of the faculty in the various institutions of the sample. The data in Table IV should prove interesting.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON BY RANK OF LANGUAGE WITH TOTAL FACULTY

Category	Total Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors and Lecturers		Total %
	Language Faculty	Total Faculty	Language Faculty	Total Faculty	Language Faculty	Total Faculty	Language Faculty	Total Faculty	Language Faculty	Total Faculty	
Total of 11 combined Departments	120 (10%) *	1103	21 (16.7%) **	277 (25.7%) *	23 (18.7%) **	246 (23.4%) *	37 (30%) **	363 (33.3%) *	43 (34.6%) **	197 (18%) *	100%
Total of 11 Divided Departments	186 (13.9%) *	1341	41 (23.6%) **	412 (31%) *	24 (13.1%) **	326 (24.5%) *	46 (24.9%) **	349 (25.3%) *	75 (38.4%) **	247 (19.2%) *	100%

* percentage of Total faculty
** percentage of language faculty

The total number of professors of all ranks in languages is obviously greater in the divided area. Some part of this is due to the greater size of the total enrollment and total faculty in the divided colleges. Yet, even when this difference is taken into consideration, 10.9 % of the faculties in colleges with combined departments are in languages while 13.9% of those with divided departments are in languages. If one were to ask how large the total language faculty of combined departments would be if the divided ratio (13.9%) were to apply, we would discover that there would be 153 faculty in languages instead of the 120 now. This would be an increase of 33 or an average of 3 additional members for each of the 11 departments.

If we were to base the ratio of faculty on student enrollment

in the divided and the combined categories, the results would be even more extreme. The combined enrollment (1967-68) for the 11 colleges with combined departments was 15,838, while the total enrollment for the divided institutions was 17,927. This gives a ratio of 17.9 to 15.8. Again, if this ratio were to apply to the 11 combined departments, the number of faculty would be 164 instead of the present 120. This is an increase of 44 or an average of 4 faculty members for each of the 11 departments.

The statistics by rank do not reveal too much difference between divided and combined departments except at the rank of full professor. Here, the percentage of full professors is somewhat greater both in the language departments and in the colleges with divided departments. The impact of the senior man reverses this tendency among associate professors. Both combined and the divided departments match the college proportion for assistant professors but both are far out of line at the instructor level. Twice as many instructors are found in languages as in ~~all~~ the average other departments. ~~combined.~~ The percentage of full professors in the individual colleges with combined departments ranges from 18% to 32% with 6 of the 11 colleges under 25%. In the divided area, it ranges from 21% to 41% with only 2 colleges under 25%.

In terms of the percentage of the total faculty of the colleges of the sample, the percentage of language faculty in colleges with combined departments ranges from 6.25% to 14.5%, while in the divided area the range is from 10% to 17.25%. Nine of the 11 combined departments have less than 12% while only 2 of the 11 divided departments have less than 12%. From these

figures it can be seen that the size of a language department is very much related to the question of division or combination. There is a tendency to have less total faculty members in a combined language department than would be the case if all languages were separated. Again, the functions of the chairman and the senior men may be in conflict, the chairman seeing the total needs of his "department" in relation to the college financial situation and the senior men seeing the needs of their particular language outside of the "department." The best interests of any one language will always be best placed in the hands of one who realizes and feels these needs. Once again, the opponents of the combined department see the possibility of the appointment as chairman of the combined department on the basis of willingness to accept the pressures for "making do" and maintaining limited size in spite of growing pressures.

B. Language Area

An analysis by language is found in Table V.

TABLE V

FACULTY BY LANGUAGE

Language	Total Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Instructors and Lecturers	
	Combined	Divided	Combined	Divided	Combined	Divided	Combined	Divided	Combined	Divided
French	41 1/3	58	5	15 1/3	12	8	10	11	14 1/3	23 2/3
Spanish	33 2/3	42 2/3	8	10	3 2/3	3	13 2/3	11	7	18 2/3
German	33 2/3	59 1/3	6	12 1/3	4 2/3	9 2/3	10	13 1/3	13	24
Russian	8 2/3	15 1/3	1	1	2 2/3	1 1/3	2/3	6 2/3	4 1/3	6 1/3
Others	2 2/3	10 2/3	0	2 2/3	0	1 2/3	2/3	4 1/3	2	2

In the use of this chart, one must take notice of the fact that the total faculty in languages is 120 for combined departments and 186 for divided departments. Nevertheless, the number of full professors in French and German is three times and two times as great in divided departments. The number of associate and assistant professors is about the same while the divided departments seem to have a larger proportion of instructors, especially in Spanish and German. The factor of the department of Romance Languages creates a special problem because most of the instructors seem to be in this category. In fact, in one such department there is one chairman and there are eleven instructors. Finally, the number of faculty in other languages is almost five times as great in divided departments.

From this data, it would seem that French and German have a greater proportion of senior faculty in divided departments. An analysis of the difference between totally divided departments and those with Romance Languages helps explain the situation in Spanish, especially when we find 5 of the 7 chairmen of such departments in French.

C. Titles

There are few areas in the college which offer such serious difficulties in the identification of faculty by discipline as in the combined language department. Of the 11 combined departments, only 5 refer to their faculty as Professors of the specific language or languages taught. Five other departments refer to their faculty as Professors of Modern or Foreign Languages and one department lists a part of its faculty in this way. In all, 65 out of

120 faculty members in combined departments hold this unique title of Professor of Modern or Foreign Languages, which, although it is technically correct, denies or conceals the existence of their major language in their identification.

This strange situation is usually defended by some who think of a field of "foreign languages" and therefore of a professor in that field. One might tolerate such a point of view, however antithetical it may be to the best interests and prestige of any single language or the sense of identification of the faculty member with that language, if there were another adequate demarcation by language elsewhere in the catalogue. Unfortunately, of the 5 combined departments which use the title in Foreign Languages and the one department which partially does so, only 2 of these identify the faculty by language in some other way. This can be done by listing the language offerings and their faculties by separate languages even within the combined department. Even worse, 45 of the 65 faculty members not identified by title can not be identified in any other way. The remaining 20 are identified with some difficulty in the complete faculty roster or through faculty names listed with courses. A student interested in French, for example, could not determine from the catalogue who represents the faculty in French.[24] In fact, in the course of my research, in order to determine the language taught by these 45 faculty members, I had to resort to past and present listings of the members of the Associations of Teachers of French, German and Spanish (AATF, AATG, AATSP) as well as various directories of scholars in the field. Some faculty had to be discovered by the place of degrees, their names, and a few had to remain anonymous.

In the group of divided departments, the same problem does exist for departments of Romance Languages. Of the 11 divided departments, 7 have such combined departments of French and Spanish. Of these 7 departments, 3 list all faculty as Professors of Romance Languages, 2 list some of their faculty this way and 2 others list faculty by language. In all, 44 faculty members are listed as Professors of Romance Languages. Six of these can be identified in other ways, but 38 must be identified by some cumbersome means. Obviously, the 4 totally divided departments offer no such problem.

In all, 109 faculty members in all 22 colleges of the sample (35% of all language faculty) are not identified by title according to their language. More seriously, 83 faculty members (27%) in the sample of 306 professors can not be identified at all without some research or personal knowledge.

This relatively minor inconvenience not only reflects the unitary view of foreign languages as a field but it may have some serious repercussions in such areas as recruitment of faculty and the search for quality students in liberal arts colleges. Quite often a recent catalogue is the only available link between a potential faculty member or student and an educational institution. An interest in German for a student planning to attend one college may quickly dim when confronted with a wall of 18 Professors of Modern Languages. If these departments do not see fit to list their faculty by language or in some other simple way to identify them by the discipline to which they will devote their academic lives, a minor inconvenience may become a serious barrier.

D. Degrees and Training: The Ph.D.

A careful study of the training and the degrees granted to faculty in languages and the comparison of such background to that of faculty in other disciplines is beyond the scope of this study. The use of the number of doctorates as a determining factor in the prestige of a college or a department faces serious difficulties when applied to language departments. The percentage of all language faculty holding a doctorate is far lower than the percentage for the entire college in each of the schools of the sample. In order to establish this percentage, it was necessary to correct certain discrepancies in the data available for all colleges. In one directory of American colleges which lists percentages of faculty holding the doctorate, it is apparent that the figures are either too high or that they have been determined in some special way by the colleges concerned. [25] A more objective listing of faculty with the doctorate, the masters and the bachelors degree offers lower figures in most cases. [26] My own analysis based on a number of college catalogues for 1967-1968 seems to justify the latter study. Discrepancies of up to 20% can be found and one can see how the method used to make the count is so important. [27] The Hawes listing for 1965-66 gives a figure of 70% for one college of the sample, the Cartter study for 1964 gives a figure of 43% for the same institution and my own count from the 1967-68 catalogue gives a figure of 50%.

The average percentage of doctorates for the colleges of the 11 combined departments according to the 1964 Cartter study is 51% ranging from 43% to 60%. The average for the 11 colleges with the divided departments is 55% ranging from 40% to 76%. The average for the 4 colleges with totally divided departments is 58%.

The average percentage of doctorates in the 22 language

departments of the sample for 1967-68 is 38% or 15% lower than for the colleges as a whole. The percentage for combined departments is 38% and for divided departments 39%. Among the full professors, 92% hold a doctorate in all 22 colleges, 100% in combined departments and 88% in divided departments. Of the associate professors, 76% hold a doctorate for all 22 colleges, 76 % in combined departments and 77% in divided departments. Of the assistant professors, 36% hold a doctorate in all 22 colleges, 26% in combined departments and 42 % in divided areas. In the totally divided departments, 50% of assistant professors hold a doctorate. Among instructors, only 1.5% hold a doctorate.[28]

In summary, the greatest percentage of language faculty holding a doctorate can be found in the 4 totally divided departments (44%), and it would seem that total division may create an environment where the doctorate is sought with greater energy than elsewhere. Generally, there are fewer language faculty with a doctorate than in most other departments and the colleges as a whole. The impact of the total number of persons taking the doctorate in languages each year on the folklore of market values in the academic marketplace would prove interesting. A recent study of recipients of American doctorates is now available and discusses many pertinent characteristics of these individuals.[29]

E. Foreign Degrees

There is probably no other area of the college as sensitive to the issue of the equivalent value of foreign degrees as the department of languages. In the larger universities the faculty is accustomed to consider in a critical and comprehensive way the

equivalent value of work carried on by potential graduate students in foreign high schools, colleges and universities. Even here there may be serious differences of opinion which often can only be resolved by special examinations and the registrars in collaboration with various departments have had to resort to such handbooks as the comprehensive study by Beatrice Hyslop.[30] There are 73 faculty members (24%) in the 22 departments of the sample who hold at least one foreign degree, and 28 of them are from French institutions, 21 from German institutions, 12 from Spanish or Latin American and 12 from all other countries. There is an even division between combined (36) and divided (37) departments.

It is obviously in the interpretation of the value of the foreign degrees and the rank offered to the faculty who hold them that major differences arise. Almost all French degrees are listed exactly as they are titled in France. The few exceptions are in the combined departments where an effort is made to list an equivalent American degree. Errors in judgement and deliberate overrating of these degrees is a common pitfall. According to the Hyslop book, the licence is the basic French degree required for future graduate study anywhere.[31] All the certificats granted are steps toward the granting of the degree, not the equivalent of a degree. If a department unfamiliar with foreign degrees makes an error in their evaluation, this is not as serious as when a language department lists a French licence as an M.A. Hyslop points out that a Diplôme d'Études Supérieures would be the equivalent of an M.A., the Doctorat-3rd cycle, between the M.A. and the Ph.D. and the Doctorat d'État our Ph.D. The C.A.P.E.S. are like an M.A. leading to teaching in secondary school and the Agrégation somewhat better than our

M.A. The two degrees, Diplôme d'Études Universitaires and the Doctorat d'Université are for foreignêrs and must be carefully evaluated on their duration and content.

Degrees from Germany are somewhat easier to evaluate as the Dr. phil. can be considered our Ph.D. The absence of good equivalents between the B.A. and the Ph.D. is a cause for some use of other criteria. Degrees from Spain cause equal problems because the Doctorado at Spanish universities is not delineated by duration of study and only implies a thesis written after the Licenciatura. [32] The seven or more years of study gives only a vague idea of the exact meaning of the degree.

r. The current dilemma of the large number of Cuban degrees in Spanish has brought very serious problems to the question of degree equivalents in the profession. The University of Havana, in the pre-Castro era, listed the Doctorado in Philosophy and Letters as well as the one in Law as being shorter-term degrees than the Doctorado in Medicine. Fidel Castro received his Doctorado en derecho about five years after finishing work in secondary school. It is clear that while the Doctorado en Filosofía y Letras is a degree of less worth than our Ph.D., it is at least in the same area while the school that would call a Doctorado en derecho a Ph.D. qualified to be a Professor of Spanish is distorting any serious effort at evaluation in a desire to list more doctorates. [33]

What is important in the consideration of this problem for combined and divided language departments is the need for a proper evaluation of all foreign degrees when making appointments. A study of the 22 colleges reveals few examples of an excessive

tendency to use equivalents of foreign degrees. These are almost all in combined departments. It is my opinion that a combined language department lends itself, either by lack of knowledge or indifference, to decisions by the dean and the chairman to over-evaluate foreign degrees, especially when the language is not represented by some knowledgeable and strong senior man. In the small liberal arts college, the vacancy is too often the senior man himself and the foreign candidate may be the only source of information on equivalent degrees. If one adds to this the more recent tendency to search for academic "bargains" the dangers are manifest. A salary that would not seem too attractive to a recent Ph.D. in French from Stanford might seem a veritable bonanza to a candidate with the Agrégation from France. The serious confrontation of this problem is not so obvious in the 22 colleges of the sample where standards are relatively high. One need only search through the catalogues of the many combined departments at the smaller and lesser known colleges to find examples of distortion of equivalence that might challenge the very accreditation of an institution.

Among the faculty at the rank of Associate and Full Professor, there does not seem to be any unwarranted tendency to over-evaluate foreign degrees. There are 9 Full Professors in both combined and divided departments with foreign degrees and all but 2 either hold a foreign equivalent of a Ph.D. or have since taken an American Ph.D. These do not include the French Doctorat d'Université. Twelve Associate Professors have foreign degrees and 10 of these hold a foreign equivalent of a doctorate or have since taken the Ph.D.

Of the 21 Assistant Professors with foreign degrees, 5 have taken either an American Ph.D. or a foreign doctorate since the earlier degree. Four have taken an American M.A. since the earlier foreign degree, generally following a French Licence or Spanish Licenciatura. Four others hold either a French Licence or a similar degree from another nation. One holds a French Diplôme and another the Agrégation. The most serious questions arise among Spanish degrees. Here, three faculty members refer to "Ph.D" degrees from Spain, one an "Ed.D." and another a "Ph.D." from Cuba, and a third claims both of the latter degrees from Cuba. Evaluation of such training will always be vague, but it is clear that in no case should we consider the equivalent a Ph.D. in American terms.

Among instructors and lecturers one finds an almost total indifference to degree evaluation in an objective manner. Of the 31 faculty members in this category in divided and combined departments, one can find references to a foreign "Ph.D" or no degree at all. There seems to be no effort at this level to secure a sound interpretation. Of the 31, there are 6 who have taken an American M.A. following a foreign Licence or its equivalent. There are 13 who simply hold a Licence or other national equivalent. A number of faculty are listed as B.A. or M.A. along with a foreign institution and these are almost all in the combined departments.

In summary, I must say that both combined and divided departments seem to be lax in their efforts to define their non-American degrees, especially when recruiting new faculty. A dean or combined chairman will often refer to a candidate with a clear equivalent to our M.A. as "one very near to a Ph.D." I have even

been informed of a case of one of the schools of the sample where a chairman and a dean referred to a doctorado en derecho as about the same as our Ph.D. In the long run, the person most qualified to consider the credentials of a person with training in French universities is a faculty member in French, who will be most zealous in his efforts to assure quality and competence in his area. It is only in this way that we can be assured of accurate evaluation of foreign degrees.

F. Other Characteristics of the Faculty

There are a number of aspects of college departments and language departments that do not lend themselves to any statistical analysis because a study of these aspects would have to be based on depth interviews and because the questions involved may be very sensitive and personal. Nepotism is one of these. Whereas many public educational systems and state universities openly prohibit nepotism on the faculty and many other schools look upon it with disfavor, it is often the salvation of the small liberal arts college. The "package deal" in hiring procedure is a means of filling the needs of the college at small expense. In addition to this approach, the college often uses nepotism to attract a male faculty member of great promise at a lower salary than he might desire simply by offering his wife a part-time or full-time job. Once again, the language department is the likely victim and the combined department offers the outstanding possibility for such schemes.

Among the combined departments of the sample, there are 5 cases of husband and wife teaching in the same department. In

4 of the 5 cases, the husband is a Full Professor and, in one case, a Chairman. There are 4 cases in the divided departments and 3 of these are in Departments of Romance Languages. The one case for a totally divided department is a part-time wife with a Ph.D. A closer examination reveals the way in which nepotism exists in both categories. In the combined departments, we find not only five cases of wives of faculty in languages, but also more than a dozen examples of wives of faculty in other departments. This is also found to a lesser degree in schools with a department of Romance Languages and is almost totally absent in the schools with totally divided language departments.

From this it would seem that the use of faculty wives is greatest in combined departments and that senior faculty with wives in the same department[15] also greatest in this category. It is not the purpose of these comments to disparage the possibility of a competent husband and wife teaching in the same area, but rather I hope to make it clear that the combined department with its dozen or more faculty members is a more fertile area for perpetuating unwarranted nepotism. A foreign wife of a new faculty member in Political Science is far more likely to be hired full-time by a dean anxious to save money and please his new political scientist or by a chairman in another language anxious to complete his staff for the coming year than by a competent and trained faculty member and chairman in that language, anxious to protect the best interests of his field.

The question of vulnerability and the combined department is related to the issue of faculty wives, who are perhaps the most timid and vulnerable of all faculty members. Without in any way arguing

about the academic integrity or quality of the persons involved, but rather pointing out the vulnerability of such individuals to material and professional pressures in the college, one can recognize certain implications in a discussion of faculty wives and an unusual number of unmarried faculty. The area of vulnerability is most important in any consideration of the best interests of a given language within a combined department or a language department within a liberal arts college. To choose an extreme example, what position can one expect of a senior faculty member in French in a combined situation when her husband is the senior person in German? Vulnerability in the area of recruitment is also a financial issue and here the needs of the faculty member being considered can be taken into account on the basis of an issue such as marital status. Some data in this area might prove interesting.

In the 11 combined departments of the sample, there are 72 male faculty members and 48 female. The males represent 60%. In the 11 divided departments, there are 125 men and 61 women. Since two of the divided areas are in colleges for men, these two areas can be removed from the data at this point and the percentage is 65% for males. In the totally divided departments, the percentage for men is 74%. In this day of the feminine mystique, only an absurd traditionalist would use such facts as an argument against women in the profession, but the reality of the presence of a large percentage of women in the languages, far greater than in most other disciplines, must be considered in terms of the relationship between sex and rank and salary and, inevitably, vulnerability in the context of the combined department of languages. The issue is not one of the rights of women, but rather to what extent the

women are being used in a context that does little to serve the cause of feminism in America and which only places a limited number of disciplines at a disadvantage in their struggle for equality in the total college context.

A recent study of doctorates from American universities now offers extensive data concerning a multitude of characteristics of new doctorates in all areas of university study and some statistics on all doctorates since 1920. [34] In any study of market values in institutions of higher learning, comparative data on marital status must rank high in importance, regardless of the sensitive nature of this consideration. For the year 1966, about 22% of all recipients of the doctorate were single. This includes 23% in the Physical Sciences and Engineering, 21% in the Biological Sciences, 21% in Social Sciences, 18% in Education and 27% in Arts and Humanities. The percentage for Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures was 32%, the highest for any field in the listing with the exception of Classics. [35] Since the age at the time of the doctorate was higher in languages than for most fields, this can not be an explanation. Anyone interested in the background, the training and other pertinent characteristics of language doctorates would find this study fascinating, but comparatively disheartening. It is not pleasant nor may it be diplomatic to discuss the vulnerability of faculty in languages and especially in the combined department in terms of faculty wives, foreign degrees and low salaries, unmarried faculty, male and female, but if the academic marketplace is a reality, then one most face the issue in a realistic way in order to recognize the causes of low market value.

XI. RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY

Any final consideration of the faculties in language areas of liberal arts colleges must place great importance on the process of recruitment for it is here that the consequences of combination and division play a most vital role. One of the primary differences between a major university and a liberal arts college at the time of faculty hiring is the role played by the dean of the college, who, in collaboration with the departmental chairman, makes the final decision. Even when the university language department is combined, the power of the chairman in hiring is very great and he is able to hand over the process of hiring to the faculty in his department who represent the language in question. This is much rarer in the liberal arts college where the dean looks upon the combined department as one entity and where, in collaboration with a chairman anxious to cooperate with the administration or unable to oppose their lack of understanding, the dean can take control of the hiring process without even consulting with the area concerned. The separate interests of each language are not taken into consideration when lesser faculty are being hired and they are often thwarted even when a senior man is being sought. At this time, the dean and even the combined chairman does not look upon the vacancy with enough awareness of the fact that an entire area, a curriculum, a considerable body of majors and a major program are without leadership, without any creative supervision and dependent upon those in other languages for their direction. A language area within a combined department with a language staff of four instructors can hardly be considered to

have true leadership. If we omit Russian for the moment, we can plainly see the dangers involved. Among the 11 combined departments, the 3 major languages are often in a tragic state of lack of competent direction. In one department, the language of the chairman has a faculty of 2 - 1 - 3 - 0 (Full, Associate, Assistant Professors and Instructor). The other two major languages have 0 - 1 - 3 - 2 and 0 - 0 - 2 - 2. In a second combined department, the language of the chairman is 1 - 1 - 3 - 0 while the other two languages are 1 - 0 - 1 - 0 and 1 - 0 - 1 - 3. In a third combined department, the language of the chairman is 1 - 0 - 0 - 1 and the other two are 0 - 0 - 0 - 2 and 0 - 0 - 2 - 0. In summary, in the 11 combined departments, of the 33 language areas in French, German and Spanish, 14 have a Full Professor as senior man and 10 of these are Chairmen of the combined departments. There are 12 language areas with an Associate Professor as senior man and 1 is a Chairman. There are 3 with Assistant Professors as senior man and none are Chairmen. There are 4 which have Instructors as senior man.

Among the 7 partially divided departments which include Romance Languages, of the 21 language areas, 12 have a Full Professor as senior man and 10 of these are Chairmen. There are 9 areas which have an Associate Professor as senior man and 4 are Chairmen. There are 2 areas with an Assistant Professor as senior man and one with an Instructor. The 3 cases of Assistant Professor and the one Instructor are in the department of Romance Languages. Among the 4 totally divided departments, of the 12 language areas, all 12 have a Full Professor as senior man and all are Chairman.

It must be quite clear that total division of languages in the liberal arts colleges is the best way to assure the recruit-

ment or the advancement of senior faculty to positions of authority over the various language areas. In totally divided departments, 12 out of 12 senior men (100%) are Full Professors. In partially divided departments, 12 out of 21 senior men (57%) are Full Professors. In combined departments, 14 out of 33 senior men (42%) are Full Professors. Also, while 0% of senior men in totally divided departments are Assistant Professors or Instructors, 3 out of 21 (14%) in partially divided departments and 7 out of 33 (21%) in combined departments hold these ranks. This does not include the senior men in Russian and other languages.

The reasons for these differences are only too obvious to anyone who has taught in a small liberal arts college. At a time of serious financial barriers, the language area can become an excellent place to save money by accepting the unitary view of one large department called Modern or Foreign Languages. This can be done even at a time when well trained faculty in languages are growing more scarce and when their absence should be creating a more favorable position for language teachers in the academic marketplace. The absence of a qualified, well paid senior man can thus be overlooked and a "temporary" Fulbright Fellow, an untrained but willing native speaker, a partially trained faculty wife in a package deal or even worse can be accepted to teach even in place of the senior faculty member. This clearly does not occur when the vacancy is that of a Chairman. Unless the Dean of the College insists on the best possible person without attempting to resort to the economics of the bargain basement, and unless the Chairman is willing to defend the best interests of a language other than his own, there is a constant danger of a lesser choice with the inevitable

ensuing deterioration of work in that language for some time to come. Whether by indifference or unwillingness to struggle for standards at best, or by hostility, resentment or competitive spirit toward another language at worst, it is possible to create a serious and long-term imbalance between the languages in a combined department by not doing all within one's means to find the best possible candidates in a highly competitive market. Ultimately, one must conclude that the best interests of any language are best presented to a college administration by someone trained in that language, someone with the warmth of feeling and the tradition necessary to recognize its value and to defend its greatness.

XII. THE FACULTY AND THE LIBERAL ARTS TRADITION

In order to establish some of the differences between the catalogue structures of combined and divided departments in liberal arts colleges, it is necessary to recognize a number of criteria which tend to create the most favorable environment for work in foreign languages for the college as a whole, for the department of languages and its faculty, for the students and for the field itself.

In all the 22 colleges of the sample, the largest total number of language faculty is 33 and the smallest is 7. The average for all schools is 14. The largest combined department has 17 members and the largest in Romance Languages has 16. Among the totally divided departments in the 4 colleges, the largest department has 6 people and the smallest has one. In the totally divided area, among the 17 separate language departments, 9 have either 4, 5, or

6 members. Among the partially divided departments including Romance Languages, the largest single department has 16 faculty members and this is the largest college of the sample. In the partially divided category, 10 of the 19 departments have between 3 and 9 members and Romance Languages creates the greater size.

The liberal arts colleges with enrollments of between 800 and 2000 students are unique institutions with special needs for their various departments. In my sample, 18 of the 22 colleges have between 800 and 2000 students, and 13 have less than 1500. In this environment, the combined language department becomes a distortion within the structure and purpose of the college. With the exception of Music, it is generally the largest area and often even larger than Music. This is so in spite of the understaffed condition I have demonstrated elsewhere. And there is little doubt that its comparatively great size is a factor in its continued operation with a shortage of staff. A French department with 4 people has a better chance of acquiring a new person in a college of 110 faculty than a combined department of 14.

The very nature of the liberal arts college, the very qualities that attract its young faculty, the sense of community within small departments tied together by interdisciplinary goals and programs are negated by an unwieldy combined department that is not only understaffed but also relegated to the fulfillment of an unpopular requirement and an isolation from the other areas. A combined department, large in size, lacking needed staff, recognized as language teachers at the lowest levels, and offering an image of one total field of foreign languages will only enhance the tragic picture that causes its separation and isolation. It

is a commentary on this extreme point that a large portion of the combined departments do not see fit to list their faculty by the language of their training, their teaching, their dedication and their affection. What is a Professor of Modern or Foreign Languages? Although a Professor of Romance Languages is a little better, the ideal should be Professors of French, Spanish, Russian, German or whatever language is that of the teacher.

XIII. CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS

A further analysis of course listings in divided and combined departments does not reveal the true situations at the many institutions. Nevertheless, the image presented for future students and potential faculty is clearly found here. The outstanding 3 descriptions of language work at a college are in divided departments and the most sketchy and vague in the combined departments. There are several exceptions. In some of the combined departments, one can plainly see the strong hand of a somewhat dogmatic chairman who tends to describe and structure work in all languages according to his ideal of work in his own area. The cause of such identical course descriptions for different languages may be the power of a chairman who has survived all difference of opinion or the sincere belief that all languages are one field. When this is done for the work in language at the lower level, first-year and second-year, one may frown and accept, but when we find this same direction for work in literature and culture, we must question the very purpose of combination. The innovative creativity so important to the relevance of work in the colleges is stifled if not destroyed by the desire for unanimity and sameness in many combined departments.

The issue of a unitary approach to language studies implies situations rarely found in the liberal arts college. A single set of requirements for the degree, a single approach to course placement, the use of language at all levels in all languages without any consideration of differences in problems of French and Russian, or a teaching perspective that does not satisfy the needs of all languages, all of these may satisfy the administrative desire for simple and inclusive solutions but they do not face the reality of strong differences of opinion between the various languages. A major in Spanish should have more than just an advisor in Spanish, he should be guided to as great an extent as possible by principles and methods expressed by those in his field. A group of teachers in one language who have a strong inclination to culture and literature over the "daily life" preoccupation, should not feel it necessary to adhere to principles established by a majority in other languages. A strong point of view voiced by a chairman and defended by those in his own language should not be permitted to use recruitment as a means of implementing those ideas in all languages. Although this is often done in any single department, the implication for a combined department of languages is far more tragic. Differences of opinion among the faculty in French may be commendable and significant and a discussion between a medieval view and a modernist one can lead to a better program, but when two faculty members in Spanish create a new and vital program for their field that may involve a controversial area such as translation, they should not have to be thwarted by colleagues representing other languages.

XIV. CONCLUSION

This study represents an effort to establish some criteria

and discover objective data to demonstrate what many language teachers have long known by experience and intuition. The search for autonomy or freedom of direction must always be laudable and need not seek statistics to advance its cause. A recent difference of opinion between the author and an editor of a major journal concerning the future of language teaching and the pride and prestige of language teachers makes it only too apparent that it is not so easy to accept a position of inferiority in the academic hierarchy.

What then are the advantages of a combined department in the small liberal arts college? Are they so prevalent for historical reasons or do they serve some useful function in the modern curriculum of liberal arts? The example of the large universities and some of the colleges lends support to the theory of further fragmentation. The simple argument here has been that either the departments are too large or that the faculty in languages can not get along. There can be no other direction in the universities and many smaller institutions will follow suit as their enrollments increase.

The liberal arts colleges, in their search for creative programs, experimental courses and interdisciplinary concepts, can use size of department to a lesser extent. Even here, 7 to 20 faculty members in 3 to 6 languages, representing from 10% to 13% of the total faculty, dominated by one chairman from one language, holding tenure for up to 17 years, is simply not within the ideals of liberal arts institutions.

I do not mean to imply that all combined departments will move in these negative directions. It is possible to have a chairman who is enlightened, generous and willing to see the needs of other languages over his own, but the system of the combined department

along with the purposes of many administrators who support it, lends itself to the abuse that can be found in this study. In a very large combined department, there is often a sub-chairman for each language, but this is only the first step toward eventual division.

It is my firm belief that the environment of the combined department lends itself to many of the problems of the field of language teaching. Lower salaries than would be warranted by the lack of trained people to teach can best be attributed to an unwillingness on the part of chairmen to present these facts to deans who live with the folklore of market values. If it is not easy to find a highly trained and experienced person in Economics or Psychology, it is virtually impossible for many colleges to find such a person in German or Russian. The difference is that the combined department is an ideal place to lower standards and find an inadequate substitute at a lower salary. Too many chairmen in one language, whatever their motives, will not fight hard enough to acquire first-rate faculty in another language.

If for no other reason than the increase in the total number of chairmen from languages in the liberal arts college, the power and prestige of languages and its relations with the college as a whole and other departments will improve. Our position on the academic landscape must be strengthened in many ways. We have tried to reach this point through a revitalization of methodology and purpose, as well as a thorough reconsideration of the processes by which we train our future teachers. It is time that we turn our attention to the very structure of our field within the institutions of higher learning in America.

FOOTNOTES

1 Educational Index, ed. Julia W. Ehrenreich (New York, 1950-1967), VIII to XVII.

2 Statistical Abstract of the U.S.: 1968, supervisor William Lerner, 89th ed. (Washington, 1968), p. 135. These statistics include a small group in Classics.

3 World Almanac and Book of Facts: 1964, ed. Harry Hansen, 85th ed. (New York, 1964).

4 Random House Guide to Graduate Study in Arts and Sciences, ed. Elga R. Wasserman and Ellen E. Switzer (New York, 1967) pp. 60-62.

5 Wasserman and Switzer, pp. 62-65. This listing includes the 41 universities listed in the A.C.E. category.

6 Directory of U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington, 1967).

7 James Cass and Max Bernbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges for Students, Parents and Counselors (New York, 1965)

8 John Robson, Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, 18th ed. (Menasha, Wisc., 1968).

9 "On the Financial Prospects for Higher Education," A A U P Bulletin, LIV, No. 2 (June, 1968), 182-241.

10 Gene R. Hawes, The New American Guide to Colleges, 3rd ed. (New York, 1966).

[11] Alexander W. Astin, "Undergraduate Achievement and Institutional Excellence," Science, CLXI (August 16, 1968), 661-668.

[12] Astin, 662.

[13] Allan M. Cartter, Ed., American Universities and Colleges, 9th ed., American Council on Education (Washington, 1964). More recent data is available on some aspects.

[14] Cartter.

[15] Hawes, op. cit.

[16] Hawes, op. cit.

[17] Hawes, op. cit.

[18] The material used here is taken from the catalogues of the 22 colleges in use in September of 1968. Some are for 1966-1968, some for 1967-1969 and some for 1968.

[19] The issues of PMLA only begin to list chairmen of language departments in 1951. The present September issue carries this listing following the names of the membership.

[20] The founding of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in September of 1967 is of importance. It now lists 5000 members (Feb., 1968).

[21] This goal is part of a statement on the purpose of language learning from the introduction to the general section on languages of one of the colleges of the sample. The college has totally divided departments.

[22] For the purpose of this breakdown, areas in 3 Asian languages have been omitted.

[23] This matter will be discussed in a later section.

[24] A number of my own students have referred to this problem at the time they were considering various colleges where they might major in Spanish.

[25] Hawes, op. cit. Data is for 1965-1966.

[26] Cartter, op. cit. Data is for 1964.

[27] Some institutions will omit faculty in Music. The desire to show a greater percentage of doctorates is understandable. Some colleges omit lower ranking faculty in languages.

[28] There are very few assistants in these colleges and only in the largest institutions.

[29] Doctoral Recipients from U. S. Universities 1958-1966. Publication 1489, National Academy of Sciences. Fred Boercker, Gen. ed. (Washington, 1967).

[30] Beatrice F. Hyslop, France, A Study of French Education and Guide to the Academic Placement of Students from France in Educational Institutions in the U.S.A., American Assn. of College Registrars and Admissions Officers, Foreign Student Committee, 1964.

[31] Hyslop, Placement Recommendations, pp. 93-99.

[32] International Handbook of Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Learning, H.M.R. Keyes, ed., 2nd ed. (Paris, 1962) pp.545-558.

33 Keyes, pp. 116-118.

34 Doctoral Recipients from U.S. Universities 1958-1966, pp. 10-11.

35 Ibid.